

REMARKS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the above-mentioned Official Action in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-18 are now pending in this application, with Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 11, 16, and 17 being independent. Claims 1, 2 and 5-8 have been amended and Claims 9-18 are newly presented herein.

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Without conceding the propriety of the rejection, Claim 8 has been amended to recite a computer-executable program stored in a computer-readable storage medium. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 101 rejection are requested.

Claims 1, 7, 8, and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,567,122 (Anderson et al.). Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,335,742 (Takemoto). Claims 3-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Takemoto in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,452,626 (Aizawa et al.).

Anderson et al. is directed to a method and system for implementing Internet access to images stored in a digital image capture unit, such as a digital still camera. In the embodiment of FIG. 7, ISP 710 transmits image data obtained from camera 100 and ISP 715 receives the transmitted image data. An Internet address of camera 100 is generated when the image data is transmitted, and ISPs 710 and 715 communicate with each other using this generated Internet address. Applicant submits, however, that the Internet address is information data which uniquely specifies the camera, for example, on the Internet network and, therefore, is not data which uniquely specifies each image data stored in the

camera. Moreover, Applicant submits that Anderson et al. is silent with regard to detailed structure of the image file system and as to details of how to generate the Internet address.

Accordingly, Anderson et al. fails to disclose or suggest at least generating second data identification information which is independent of a logical data management system in an information generating apparatus, on the basis of a data string which is usable to uniquely specify each of the plurality of data objects and is extracted from first data identification information which depends on the logical data management system, and restoring the first data identification information on the basis of the second data identification information, as is recited in independent claims 1, 2, 7 and 8.

Nor does Anderson et al. disclose or suggest generating data object identification information which is independent of a logical data management system (existing in an information generating apparatus), by executing a logical calculation of path information of the data object, wherein the path information depends on the logical data management system, and restoring the path information of the data object on the basis of the data object identification information, as is recited in independent claims 10, 11, 16 and 17.

Thus, Anderson et al. fails to disclose or suggest important features of the present invention recited in the independent claims.

Takemoto is directed to file management and manipulation using graphical displays and textual descriptions. As understood by Applicant, in Takemoto, a keyword, as identification information, is added to image data obtained by a camera. The keyword, however, is not information data which can uniquely specify each image data because Takemoto provides the same keyword to a plurality of image data. Moreover, the keyword is not generated on the basis of a data string which is usable to uniquely specify each of a plurality of data objects and is extracted from first data identification information which depends on the logical data management system. Takemoto is not believed to disclose or

suggest the features of the independent claims noted above as being deficient in Anderson et al.

Aizawa et al. was cited for utilizing external connectors and a communication cable between a camera and personal computer. However, Aizawa et al. is not believed to remedy the deficiencies of the citations noted above with respect to the independent claims.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the §§ 102 and 103 rejections are respectfully requested.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention is patentably defined by independent Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 11, 16 and 17. Dependent Claims 3-6, 9, 12-15 and 18 are also allowable, in their own right, for defining features of the present invention in addition to those recited in the independent claims. Individual consideration of the dependent claims is requested.

Applicant submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the above-noted Office Action and an early Notice of Allowability are respectfully requested

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010 All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark A. Williamson/

Mark A. Williamson
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 33,628

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

MAW/ylr

DC_MAIN 273753v1